

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HISTORIC CONSERVATION BOARD

MONDAY, JUNE 27, 2005

3:00 P.M., J. MARTIN GRIESEL ROOM, CENTENNIAL PLAZA II

The Historic Conservation Board met at 3:00 P.M., in the J. Martin Griesel Room, Centennial Plaza II, with members: Bloomfield, Chatterjee, Kirk, Raser, Sullebarger, Senhauser, and Spraul-Schmidt and Wallace present. Absent: Kreider.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS GATEWAY CONDOMINIUMS, VINE STREET BETWEEN E. 12TH STREET AND CENTRAL PARKWAY, OVER-THE-RHINE, HISTORIC DISTRICT

Staff member Adrienne Cowden presented a report on a Certificate of Appropriateness for revisions to the approved plans for the Gateway Condominiums. The HCB approved the initial plan set in February 9, 2004; these most recent revisions were presented and discussed at a joint meeting with the Urban Design Review Board on June 13, 2005.

Revisions include the following:

1. Removal of the handrail from the lower level roof decks.
2. Deletion of the ceilings on the upper level residential decks.
3. Modifications to the "plaid" grid on the E. 12th Street (north elevation).
4. A change in the finish material of the returns on the fourth floor and first floor live/work units.
5. Removal of the metal frame kiosk at the corner of Vine Street and Central Parkway.

Staff stated that only David Kirk, DNK Architects, representing the applicant was present for a pre-hearing meeting on Wednesday, June 22, 2005. No community organization, adjacent property owner or other interested party contacted staff concerning this application.

Mr. Senhauser said he did not recall seeing the proposed privacy fences separating the rooftop spaces in earlier plans. Mr. Kimbler answered that the deck is a buyer option and that the deck and fence would be of pressure treated wood. Mr. Senhauser suggested that the fences be of a material found elsewhere in the building, since they would be visible from the street.

Mr. Senhauser asked for clarification regarding the proposed returns and how the surface would be detailed, particularly at the first floor entries. Mr. Kirk responded the cementitious board be mounted flush with the face brick and treated similarly to other parts of the building where brick and board meet.

The loss of the corner kiosk frame was discussed. Mr. Kimbler indicated that he was pursuing an alternative plan for public art, but had not settled on a solution, nor had he found funding for the work. In answer to Ms. Sullebarger, he said he understood the Board would have to approve an alternate plan, but could not give a timeframe returning to the Board. He agreed that the issue needs to be resolved before occupancy and that he thought the designers could be back to the Board within three months.

The Board expressed concern that some acceptable alternative be found to compensate for the void left at the corner of Vine Street and Central Parkway. Mr. Chatterjee emphasized that any solution should emphasize the corner as a gateway to the neighborhood. Ms. Spraul-Schmidt that she was more concerned about the design issue created by the removal of the kiosk than about the relocation of the public art.

BOARD ACTION

The Board voted unanimously (motion by Sullebarger, second Spraul-Schmidt) with amendments to take the followings actions:

1. Approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the removal of handrails from the lower roof decks, modifications to the Vine Street decks and E. 12th Street “plaid” grid, and the use of painted cementitious board on the fourth-story side elevations along Vine Street.
2. Deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for the wood privacy fence dividing wood deck on lower roofs. The revised design should be submitted to the Urban Conservator for review and approval.
3. Approve a Certificate of Appropriateness to delete the metal frame kiosk from the design on the condition that final construction drawings for the project’s artwork and the revised design shall be submitted to the Historic Conservation Board prior to occupancy for review and approval.

MR. KIRK JOINED THE BOARD

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS RELOCATION OF THE TYLER DAVIDSON
FOUNTAIN NORTHEAST CORNER OF FIFTH AND VINE STREETS**

Mr. Raser recused himself.

3CDC had made an initial presentation to the Board on June 13, 2005 summarizing the most recent plans for the redesign of Fountain Square. Mr. Senhauser stated that the Board had read the staff’s recommendation and requested the applicant present its proposal for the relocation of the Tyler Davidson Fountain as part of that redesign.

Project architect Tom Sens stated that the Fountain would be moved approximately 110’ north of its present location; improvements will also be made to the water flows from the Fountain. He described its new location and summarized other proposed changes to Fountain Square that had been presented in greater detail at the preliminary design review. Mr. Sens asked if the plaque to the east of the Fountain was truly an historic plaque. Ms. Cowden responded that it contains information concerning the Fountains history including its renovation in 2000.

Ms. Sullebarger moved the staff recommendation (second by Spraul-Schmidt) that the Historic Conservation Board take the following action and approve the removal of the Tyler Davidson Fountain with the following conditions:

1. The fountain shall be removed and stored as necessary to prevent damage to the monument during the renovation work to Fountain Square.
2. The fountain shall be reinstalled in Fountain Square in the location shown in the attached drawings and approved by the City Planning Commission on June 6, 2005.
3. The historic plaque associated with the fountain shall be retained and reinstalled as part of the Fountain Square redesign project.
4. 3CDC, BHDP or other responsible entity shall apply for and receive a Certificate of Appropriateness for any work undertaken on the fountain, basin and sculptural figures.

Mr. Chatterjee asked if it was valid for the Board to even review a COA for the Fountain since City Council and the Planning Commission has already approved the proposal. Mr. Forwood responded that the Planning Commission has the authority under the Municipal Code to approve the location of public art; the HCB has the authority to approve any environmental change to the Fountain including its relocation, so both bodies must issue approvals.

Mr. Bloomfield commented that he would probably disapprove the relocation of the Fountain; he felt it was a foolish use of city's resources. He said it is a symbol of the City, highly visible from the street, not hidden within the plaza. He said that it loses its prominence as well as its historical location and that he is sorry he was not at the first meeting to express his concerns.

Mr. Chatterjee said that he agreed totally with Mr. Bloomfield and wanted to go on record opposing the relocation. He added that the Fountain does not have to be centered in the Square and that historically the most successful designs have fountains set off center creating tension and energy.

Mr. Sens responded that he appreciated the Board's comments and expertise, but the Fountain had been located to accommodate and complement all the other elements incorporated into the redesign of Fountain Square. He indicated that 3CDC had considered locating the Fountain at the very corner of Vine and Fifth Street, but at meetings and discussions, community stakeholders favored the proposed location. Director of Economic Development Chad Munitz, said that a primary reason for moving the Fountain 110 feet to the north was to maximize the size and flexibility for gathering; he pointed out that the new design create a seating section so people could enjoy the Fountain.

Mr. Chatterjee stated that he does not agree with the Urban Design Review regarding the other fountains proposed for the Square; he felt they would be in competition with the Fountain and are not needed. He also said that the expressed reason for relocating the Fountain was to lower the grade of the Square, but this was not being accomplished. Mr. Bloomfield said that a feeling of enclosure is being lost and that the new design for the Square would not bring life back to the Square or make the area a more welcoming place.

Margo Warminski of the Cincinnati Preservation Association said the Fountain is symbolic and deserves a setting worthy of its value. She indicated that the Fountain is presently located in the center of the surrounding buildings (if not the plaza) and that the Fountain should retain its east/west axis on Fifth Street.

Ms. Sullebarger said that although she would prefer to see the Fountain remain in its present location, she was sympathetic to the design issues and planned to vote for its relocation.

BOARD ACTION

The Board voted unanimously (Mr. Raser recused himself) to deny approval of staff recommendation.

ADJOURN

As there were no other items for consideration by the Board, the meeting adjourned.

William L. Forwood
Urban Conservator

John C. Senhauser, Chairman

Date: _____